

### **III. REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-9 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 3-6 and 8 have been amended herein; and, claim 2 is cancelled. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is requested.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones *et al.* (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0212800), hereinafter “Jones”, in view of Hood *et al.* (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0169836), hereinafter “Hood”.

With respect to the rejection of claim 1 under the combination Jones and Hood, Applicants submit that the combination does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a method for sharing network access capacities between a master Internet service provider and a client Internet service provider that includes, *inter alia*, replacing said subscriber identifier and said password by a *virtual subscriber identifier and a virtual password*, associated to said Internet service provider identifier, when said access request comes from a subscriber of said client Internet service provider, before determining if a new connection may be established for a subscriber of said client Internet service provider. (Emphasis added) (See e.g., claim 1 and previously found in claim 2).

In making the rejection of claim 2 (note: feature now found in claim 1), the Office offers merely “(paragraphs, 0009-0010, 0021-0023)” from Jones in support of the rejection. Office Action, item 9, pages 4-5. Applicants have reviewed the cited sections, and Jones in its entirety, and fail to see adequate teaching for the referenced feature. In fact, the first two paragraphs cited are extracted from the “Summary” section, while the later three paragraphs refer to figures 1 and 2 in Jones. In any event, neither of the sections teach or suggest the employment of replacing identifying information with the virtual identifying information as in the claimed invention. Further, based on the short cite offered, it is not clear to Applicants what *specific* elements in Jones allegedly teach or suggest, for example, a virtual subscriber identifier and a virtual password htat replace the subscribers identifier and password. Hood does not remedy this glaring deficiency found in Jones. In view of the foregoing, Jones and Hood, both individually and in combination, do not disclose each and every feature of claim 1.

Dependent claims 3-9 are believed allowable for the same reasons stated above, as well as for their own additional features.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 4, 2007

---

/Joseph J. Christian/

Joseph J. Christian  
Reg. No.: 51,560

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044